

Date: Mon, 6 Jun 94 04:30:10 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #241
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Mon, 6 Jun 94 Volume 94 : Issue 241

Today's Topics:

----> Re: Usefulness of the amateur service
 Usefulness of the amateur service (4 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Mon, 6 Jun 1994 01:48:00 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!cat.cis.Brown.EDU!brunix!maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu!
md@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: ----> Re: Usefulness of the amateur service
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

CMSMANDELIN@minna.acc.iit.edu (The Artation) writes:

> First let me say that I think you are underestimating emergency
> communications.
> Granted a really serious emergency is rare, but so is a flat tire. We still
> would be foolish not to prepare. Many people have told me that the cellular
> phone has made mobile ham operators obsolete in emergency situations. This may
> be true in cases of highway accidents and the like, but in the case of true
> disasters, the cellphone service will be down for a long long time.

Any emergency management agency or relief service which builds its
emergency communications network around cell service is incredibly inept.

You are correct in stating that the ARS provides emergency communications in
disaster situations. Over the past couple of years we've seen several

examples.

However, does this qualify as a "national benefit"? What percentage of licensed operators actually participated in those emergency situations? Were their actions only something that could be obtained as the result of having an ARS, or, if the ARS didn't exist, would other, better systems be in place to accomplish the same type of tasks?

I happen to think that if the ARS didn't exist, that other systems performing a similar task would be in place. I don't think that the ARS adds value to the nation as a whole with our presence. Because of this, I think its inappropriate to call the ARS a SERVICE, but to call it what it really is today - a hobby. Its been sold as a hobby by the League and other organizations seeking to get "new blood" into the hobby, and that's exactly what its become: a hobby, not a service.

> Also, I do think that the ARS provides other valuable services to the nation.
> The thing is that many of these "services" are indirect. Many of our modern
> conveniences (e.g. the above-mentioned mobile phone) came directly or
> indirectly from some guy playing around with amateur radio. Big electronics
> companies may spend billions on research, but it is very consumer-driven.

Perhaps, but the presence of the ARS didn't guarantee these things; if a market existed for them, then companies would have developed them on their own. Again, the ARS offers nothing to the nation that isn't or can't be obtained/given in other ways/means.

MD

--

-- Michael P. Deignan
-- Amalgamated Baby Seal Poachers Union, Local 101
-- "Get 'The Club'... Endorsed by Baby Seal poachers everywhere..."

Date: Mon, 6 Jun 1994 01:31:52 GMT
From: brunix!maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu!md@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Usefulness of the amateur service
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

cmoore@ilx018.intel.com (Cecil A. Moore -FT-~) writes:

> Hi Michael, in 40+ years of being a ham, I have lost count of the times
> I have used my ham radio to assist others. You can say that I could just
> as easily do it over a cellphone, but I don't have a cellphone.

Yes, you don't, but hundreds of others do. Ham radio as a "community service" along the roadside is a moot point today. I've lost count of the number of times I've heard a motorist accident or disabled vehicle report called in only to be told "we already have that, thank you".

The point of my question was that someone said that the amateur radio service is a SERVICE to the nation, not a hobby. I do not believe that statement to be true, and I don't think that anyone can cite "benefits" that the amateur service provides today. Sure, we can each cite specific, isolated incidents, but these are not indicative of the amateur radio hobby as a 600,000+ member whole.

MD

--

-- Michael P. Deignan
-- Amalgamated Baby Seal Poachers Union, Local 101
-- "Get 'The Club'... Endorsed by Baby Seal poachers everywhere..."

Date: Mon, 6 Jun 1994 02:07:26 GMT
From: brunix!maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu!md@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Usefulness of the amateur service
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

prov7672@nova.gmi.edu (Benetton-Ford) writes:

> As a scholar of some learning, you must recognise what argument you are
> begging in this series of postings. You propose a new organisation or
> system, utilising 'some other type of resources' to replace the ARS in
> it's mission during emergency communications.

No, I'm not "proposing" anything. I'm simply stating that the claim that the ARS is a "benefit" to the nation is not true. Services that the ARS provides could easily be duplicated or even bettered in other ways. There is no single, unique, irreplaceable "service" that the amateur community supplies that justifies its existance today as a "service". As a hobby, yes, but not as a service.

> You then ask the amateur
> radio operators to defend their own existance: 1) using the assigned
> portions of the electromagnetic spectrum, and 2) as an organisation that
> does more than 'chit-chat' on thier radios.

As a hobby, I could care less what your area of interest is. Others have stated that as a hobby amateur radio will have a tough time justifying

its occupation of so much valuable bandwidth.

> While not germane to this discussion, your postings to this group alone
> have been numerous and at times highly contentious.

What can I say? I enjoy a good philosophical debate.

> Throughout your
> postings, you have argued for the protection of your closed repeater by the
> FCC, as well as it's coordination by your local coordination group. By
> implication, you ask for someone to challenge your coorinated status.

I haven't argued for the protection of my closed repeater, I've stated that the FCC already recognizes my closed repeater as completely valid and acceptable within the spirit of amateur radio.

> Additionally, in another thread, you make very sweeping, generalized
> statements regarding what, I read as, your personal toughts toward a more
> 'fair' testing system.

Actually, I've proposed an entirely new testing system and licensing scheme, with two license classes instead of six and simplified licensing requirements. But, you probably missed that message.

> The point to be taken from the above paragraph is only that, at times, I,
> and myself alone, irrespective of my amateur licensing, regard your
> positions throughout to be at odds with each other. The only benefit
> to come of this is to agitate and irritate others into writing follow-ups,
> such as this one, I will admit, and for you to see your thread grow.

Ah, but for true intellectual stimulation one must constantly engage in philosophical debates. A good debater will also, on occasion, debate on the side of an issue which s/he personally disagrees with. This latter example aids in the further development of excellent debating techniques. In many of the classes I teach I often require students to defend a position which they personally disagree with.

> The argument as you have stated it, paraphrased here, is 'explain to me
> why you think that you are worthwhile.' You will always win the argument
> with 3 words: "I don't believe."

Ah, but its just another form of the utimate question - "Why am I here?" - which has been pondered by philosophers throughout the eons.

> This will then, with some likelihood = p , p<1, turn into a flame war
> along the lines of the thread to which you have contributed regarding the
> Closed v. Open Repeater systems in California.

A flame war will only start when the participants no longer have any substantive arguments to present and must instead rely upon ad hominem attacks against individuals to "prove" their point. I think this is hardly the case in the Closed v. Open Repeater systems thread (for the most part.)

> Returning the ball to your half of the court: Explain to us, the readers,
> of your new plan to revolutionize emergency communications. Defend the
> plan, in much the same way you ask us to defend the status quo.

Again, I propose nothing. I ask the question: what irreplaceable benefit do you as an amateur operator provide the nation such that you are a "national benefit"?

Emergency communications is usually the first thing people use as justification. Would the nation fall apart if the ARS was removed from the emergency communication scene? No. Other, even better, systems would be installed in their place.

> P.S.: Yes, I am a no-code tech, for less than one year, but involved for
> the three years that I have been studying for my 2 under-graduate degrees.
> And I am studying CW, with every intention to go through the 6-level
> licensing process.

Wait a few years. Maybe you'll only have to go through two if my plan catches on.

MD

--

-- Michael P. Deignan
-- Amalgamated Baby Seal Poachers Union, Local 101
-- "Get 'The Club'... Endorsed by Baby Seal poachers everywhere..."

Date: 6 Jun 1994 03:05:12 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!
hamblin.math.byu.edu!news.byu.edu!news@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Usefulness of the amateur service
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

: What can I say? I enjoy a good philosophical debate.

I have studied philosophy, etc. etc. and debating. These avenues are only worth while and productive in my estimation when individuals are indeed honest in heart and are willing to look beyond what can be conveyed in words and look for truth, pure truth. To the person only interested in a good debate, you will not get very far nor is it worth wasting any time on. He isn't interested in truth but only in the argument per se. What others have already said substantiate the claim that Amateur Radio is not ONLY a hobby but also a service. I've had much similar experience and out here in the west, the local police departments, fire departments, etc. have allready solicited our help on a number of occasions because they just don't have the man power to maintain that kind of state of readiness all of the time. The sherrif's dept. for example has a team of committed amateurs that regularly are involved in search and rescue operations, who through their "tinkering" have become quite proficient in finding airplanes downed in the mountains, etc. etc. The local police dept. had a big problem with crime in one district and the special investigator approached our club for our help because he had neither the man power nor resources (i.e. radios either) to watch the area for weeks on end (providing a citizens watch- we knew and could track every thing that came and went and could do so in an effiecient organized manner because of those skills aquired from practicing our "hobby". They said (and it was true) that it would never have been possible without us. Through numerous times, we had proved our efficiency, professionalism and skill, and thus have gained their trust and now are on their minds when they need this SERVICE. So much for the current system filling in the holes because there is a need... they just don't have the resources we have provided neither could the community afford it if it wanted too- and these weren't even times of "major" crisis but things that never-the-less needed our help to resolve.

You are, by your own admission, just interested in "a good philisophical debate" and not in answering any sincere question.

I move that the argument be dropped until you are really interested in an answer.

-Vince

Date: 6 Jun 1994 04:59:49 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!cs.utexas.edu!convex!news.duke.edu!eff!news.kei.com!
ssd.intel.com!chnews!cmoore@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Usefulness of the amateur service
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Michael P. Deignan (md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu) wrote:

: Yes, you don't, but hundreds of others do. Ham radio as a "community
: service" along the roadside is a moot point today. -- Michael P. Deignan

Could be it's only your part of the country where ham radio is a moot point. 'Round these here parts, tain't nobody can afford a cellphone. Seriously, where I live, cellphones don't work. The entire nation is *NOT* like Brown University. About once a week I shoot a coyote to keep the pack from eating my dogs and cats. About once a month, I help someone with my ham radio because I may be the only person along for the next day or so. Thank God (and the Arizona Repeater Assoc.) for mountain top repeaters. Tain't no cell sites SE of Queen Creek, AZ. Tain't even no runnin' water. If your car ever breaks down around here, you had better pray for a ham to come along. Otherwise, the illegal aliens will leave what's left of you for the buzzards.

73, KG7BK, CecilMoore@delphi.com

Date: Mon, 6 Jun 94 03:59:49 -0500
From: news.delphi.com!usenet@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2sib8p\$sq2@nyx10.cs.du.edu>, <rogjdCqrt30.G79@netcom.com>, <2std7b\$5t5@nyx10.cs.du.edu>+
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

Jay Maynard <jmaynard@nyx10.cs.du.edu> writes:

>There's a group on one side that believes in honoring commitments, and in
>dealing honestly and fairly with people, and another much larger group that
>wants to break promises and run the pioneers off because they now covet their
>neighbor's property.

Reread Part 97. No one owns an amateur frequency. The only property rights here are in the physical hardware of the repeater.

>Have you been there? I have. I was president of the Texas VHF-FM Society
>while it was defending itself against a lawsuit brought by someone who wanted
>us to change our policies to accomodate his wishes. (That wasn't the subject
>of the suit, but that was the underlying motive.) It has happened before, and
>it WILL happen again if your ideas come to pass.

Which is indeed unfortunate, and the reason why reform would require FCC action to allow coordinators to take other factors into account.

>Eminent domain takings require compensation for the fair market value of what

>is taken.

Once again, no one owns a frequency.

-- Ed Ellers, KD4AWQ

Date: Mon, 6 Jun 1994 09:31:37 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!
nduehr@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2sib8p\$sq2@nyx10.cs.du.edu>, <rogjdCqrt30.G79@netcom.com>, <2std7b\$5t5@nyx10.cs.du.edu>
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

Jay Maynard (jmaynard@nyx10.cs.du.edu) wrote:

: Even so, the still own (unless they've sold it) that land. It's the same
: thing as homesteaders: They were granted land in order that someone would make
: use of it. You can't take that away from them now. Even if you tell them, "Oh,
: you can move your house, and equipment, and livestock, and other
: improvements", you've still destroyed its value.

You seem to forget here that the ham radio spectrum is OWNED by all hams,
if you want to use an analogy of OWNERSHIP.

: There's lots of it available, too, without resorting to forcing folks off of
: their homesteads.

THEIR homesteads? I think not. Their repeater maybe, but if they aren't
operating it in the interests of the GROUP of OWNERS at large, then why
allow it to continue? FCC come tear this roadblock down so the majority
can use THEIR OWNED frequency.

: There's a group on one side that believes in honoring commitments, and in
: dealing honestly and fairly with people, and another much larger group that
: wants to break promises and run the pioneers off because they now covet their
: neighbor's property.

None of the new hams ever made you or anyone else a promise. YOUR
frequency coordinators that are on YOUR side or are members of YOUR group
made a promise to coordinate frequencies in a FAIR and JUST manner for ALL.

: Have you been there? I have. I was president of the Texas VHF-FM Society
: while it was defending itself against a lawsuit brought by someone who wanted
: us to change our policies to accommodate his wishes. (That wasn't the subject
: of the suit, but that was the underlying motive.) It has happened before, and

: it WILL happen again if your ideas come to pass.

Nice how this comment is very lacking on details, isn't it? Did that lawsuit even apply to our current discussion? Just checking.

: Eminent domain takings require compensation for the fair market value of what : is taken.

Nothing's being taken... just coordinated fairly for all OWNERS involved.

: There are those who would argue that manifest destiny is a euphemism for : taking away many people's land and livelihoods wrongly. That argument would : certainly apply here.

You don't use the frequencies to make a living (illegal) obviously, and it isn't YOUR land to "stake a claim" on. It is public property of the hams involved, which include ALL hams in Southern California if I am reading this thread right.

Yes, I do respect your right to put up a repeater and not have it interferred with, no problems there... I am just showing you that ALL hams are the so-called OWNERS of the frequencies that YOUR repeater operates on. YOU do NOT OWN that frequency just because you are parked on it, and if a better use for that frequency comes along in the amateur community at large, it would be considered courteous of the small cliqish repeater group to allow some more of the ham community at large to have access to those frequencies as well. Either by opening their repeaters to outsiders, or taking them off the air altogether. Wasted spectrum on quiet repeaters and simplex channels, and any open spectrum without anyone using it for whatever reason is sad.

Hope this adds to the conversation. Off to the balloon launch!

By the way, PP-ASEL? Me too... can't wait for the new DEN to open!

Regards,

--

Nate Duehr
nduehr@netcom.com

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #241
